

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 1, 4, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over the patent to Gelati.

Also, the drawings are objected to and the claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112.

In connection with the Examiner's formal objections and rejections, applicant has submitted a copy of the drawings with the proposed correction and amended the claims correspondingly.

After carefully considering the Examiner's grounds for the rejection of the claims over the art, applicant has amended claims 1 and 7, the broadest claims on file, so as to more clearly define the present invention and to distinguish it from the prior art.

It is believed to be advisable before the analysis of the prior art to explain the subject matter of the present invention.

The present invention deals with a unit for quick connection and disconnection of conductors, in particular, two conductors 8, 8a, with respect to the shown embodiment, and includes two mechanical devices accommodated in a single body 1. Each of the mechanical devices is formed so that a quick connection or disconnection of one of the two conductors can be provided without impairing another conductor of the same mechanical device and without impairing the conductors in another mechanical device. Each of the mechanical devices includes an operating lever 9 having two identical and independent levers 9a, 9b symmetrically located with respect to a contact plane, and each lever is provided with a top flat base for operation and ends in the rounded lower end 11a with a stop latch 11b. A resilient metal strip 12 is located under the lever and keeps the lever raised, wherein the receiving metal strip has a top end divided into two symmetrical and spaced parts including one part for each identical and independent lever 9a, 9b. Contacting bases are further provided and formed also symmetrically and independently from one another. With such a construction when one of the identical and independent levers 9a or 9b is pressed down, it bends downwards the corresponding symmetrical and spaced part 12a or 12b under the contact base 14 which will allow that the end of the conductor, 8, 8a can be easily introduced through the related side hole 7, being situated under a convex bar of the contact base 14. When the

above mentioned one identical and independent lever is no longer pressed down, it leaves its position (9a in the drawing) passing to its normal position (9 in the drawings) pushed by the corresponding symmetrical and spaced part of the resilient metal strip 12a or 12b, which in turn strongly presses the conductor against the contact base. The quick connection of the conductor is thus carried out without impairing the positioning of the second conductor previously connected as well without disconnecting them when they are connected.

Turning now to the references and particularly to the European application to Gelati, it can be seen that this reference discloses an electrical connector with some features which are similar to the device of the present invention. In the connector disclosed in the patent to Gelati there are two independently operating levers in each lever, as well as top parts of the elastic metal strip. However, the device in accordance with the present invention as now defined in the amended claim 1, clearly and patentably distinguishes from the device disclosed in the patent to Gelati in that in the device of the present invention each of the two identical and independent levers 9a, 9b cooperates with only one symmetrical and spaced part 12a, 12b of the elastic metal strip 12 as shown in the drawings attached to the previous Amendment. In contrast, when in the patent to Gelati, the lever H

or H1 is pressed down, the tooth I lowers down the two halves J and K at the same time, and the two cables are disconnected at the same time.

It is therefore believed that the new features of the present invention which are now defined in claims 1 and 7 clearly and patentably distinguish the present invention from the connector disclosed in the patent to Gelati.

The Examiner rejected the original claims as being anticipated by the patent to Gelati. In connection with this it is believed to be advisable to cite the decision in re Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) in which it was stated:

"Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim."

Definitely, the connector disclosed in the patent to Gelati does not have each and every element of the present invention defined in claims 1 and 7, and therefore it is believed that the anticipation rejection should be considered as no longer tenable and should be withdrawn.

It is also not obvious to arrive at the applicant's invention from the teaching of the reference, since the reference does not provide any hint or suggestion for the new features of the present invention which are now defined in the amended independent claims.

It is believed that claims 1 and 7 should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.

It is also believed that claim 6 as amended defines additional features which are new and patentable per se, in addition to the features defined in claim 1.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be

helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27233